

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-22, 24-28, 30-34 and 36-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of any foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-17, 19-22, 24-28, 30-34, and 36-38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al (5,598,514) and Claim 18 remains rejected over Purcell in view of Nishino et al (5,237,424). In this Final Office Action, the Examiner states that Applicant's arguments filed 11/25/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 21, 27 and 33 to overcome the rejection. As previously noted, Purcell does not describe an "interleaved YCbCr 4:2:0", but rather 4:2:2, which is conventionally known. In YCbCr 4:2:0, there are twice as many luminance samples as total number of chrominance samples in the two chrominance components. In a 4:2:2 format, the number of luminance samples is equal to the sum of the number of samples in the two chrominance components. In Figure 6B of Purcell there are 16 luminance samples (Y) and 8 + 8 chrominance samples (U and V) which means that the sub sampling format is 4:2:2. Hence, Purcell does not disclose an interleaved YCbCr 4:2:0.

The concept of storing YUV 4:2:0 in an interleaved format is central to the present invention and Purcell fails to disclose or suggest storing YUV 4:2:0 in an interleaved format. The standard way of storing YUV4:2:2 is in an interleaved format so it is not surprising that Purcell in his examples in the drawings shows the pixels in 4:2:2 format interleaved. This does not mean that a skilled video engineer automatically would store YUV 4:2:0 video interleaved after reading the Purcell patent. The obvious and most practical way of implementing Purcell's invention for YUV 4:2:0 would be to keep the luminance and the chrominance blocks separate and not interleaved.

Nishino fails to overcome the deficiencies of Purcell as it teaches a method for interleaved storage on tape of compressed YUV 4:2:2 video, not uncompressed YUV 4:2:0; and Nishino does not disclose or suggest full scan line interleaving.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: March 9, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com